



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,504	09/07/2000	Peter Krause	004860.P2449	2231

7590 09/16/2004

Andrew C Chen
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

YANCHUS III, PAUL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2116

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,504

Applicant(s)

KRAUSE ET AL.

Examiner

Paul B Yanchus

Art Unit

2116

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 17-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) ✓
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final office action is in response to amendments filed on 8/19/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 11-13, 15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee, US Patent no. 6,345,364.

Regarding claim 1, Lee teaches a power supply circuit for a digital processing system, the circuit comprising:

a first stage [Rectifier, DPMS Power Switch, Transformer, PWM Circuit and SMPS Output Circuit in Figure 2] having a first output coupled to a first component [V_{out} in Figure 2 is supplied to display system units, column 4, lines 32-33] of the digital processing system and a second output [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5] which is different from the first output;

a second stage [Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2] associated with a second component of the digital processing system [Micro-Controller in Figure 2], said second stage coupled to said first stage [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5]; and

Art Unit: 2116

wherein said first stage drives said second stage using the second output [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5], and wherein the second stage transforms the second output to generate a third output [V_{CC}] to drive the second component [column 4, lines 3-5].

Regarding claim 2, Lee teaches that first and second stages are separated from each other [Figure 2].

Regarding claim 5, Lee teaches that the first component comprises a display device [display system units, column 3, lines 14-16 and column 4, lines 31-32] and the second component comprises a microprocessor [microcontroller, column 4, lines 34-35].

Regarding claim 6, Lee teaches that said first stage is located proximately to said display device and said second stage is located proximately to said microprocessor [Figure 2].

Regarding claim 7, Lee teaches that said first stage provides power for said first component [display system units, column 3, lines 14-16 and column 4, lines 31-32] and said second stage provides power for said second component [microcontroller, column 4, lines 34-35].

Regarding claim 9, Lee teaches a power supply circuit for a computer system, the circuit comprising:

a first circuit [Rectifier, DPMS Power Switch, Transformer, PWM Circuit and SMPS Output Circuit in Figure 2] having a first output capable of providing power to a first component of the computer system [V_{out} in Figure 2 is supplied to display system units, column 4, lines 32-33] and a second output which is different from the first output [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5]; and

Art Unit: 2116

a second circuit [Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2] capable of providing power [to a second component of the computer system [Micro-Controller in Figure 2 and V_{CC} , column 4, lines 3-5];

wherein said first circuit drives the second circuit through the second output [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5], and wherein the second circuit transforms the second output to generate a third output [V_{CC} in Figure 2] to drive the second component [Micro-Controller in Figure 2 and column 4, lines 3-5].

Regarding claim 11, Lee teaches that said second circuit and said second component are disposed on a printed circuit board [Figure 2].

Regarding claim 12, Lee teaches that said first circuit is located within an enclosure of the computer system and proximately to said first component, and wherein said second circuit is located within said enclosure and proximately to said second component [Figure 2].

Regarding claim 13, Lee teaches that the first component comprises a display device [display system units, column 3, lines 14-16 and column 4, lines 31-32] and the second component comprises a microprocessor [microcontroller, column 4, lines 34-35].

Regarding claims 15 and 17, Lee teaches a computer system comprising:

a power supply circuit coupled to a display device [display system units, column 3, lines 14-16 and column 4, lines 31-32] and a microprocessor of the computer system [microcontroller, column 4, lines 34-35], wherein said power supply circuit is capable of supplying power to said display device and said microprocessor using at least two distinct power supply stages [first stage is Rectifier, DPMS Power Switch, Transformer, PWM Circuit and SMPS Output Circuit in Figure 2 and second stage is Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2];

Art Unit: 2116

a main circuit coupled to said display device using a first output [Rectifier, DPMS Power Switch, Transformer, PWM Circuit and SMPS Output Circuit in Figure 2]; and

a secondary circuit coupled to said microprocessor [Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2];
and

wherein said main circuit drives said secondary circuit using a second output [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5] which is different from the first output, and wherein said secondary circuit transforms said second output to generate a third output [V_{CC}] to drive the microprocessor [column 4, lines 3-5].

Regarding claim 18, Lee teaches that said main circuit and said secondary circuit are physically isolated from each other [Figure 2].

Regarding claim 19, Lee teaches that said main circuit and said secondary circuit are electrically coupled to each other [V_{DC} supplies power to Auxiliary Power Supply in Figure 2, column 4, lines 2-5].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2116

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, US Patent no. 6,345,364, in view of, Jansen, US Patent no. 5,835,360¹.

Regarding claim 3, Lee, as described above, teaches a multi-stage power supply circuit for a digital processing system. Lee does not explicitly teach that the stages are coupled to each other by a two wire bus. However, as shown by Jansen, transferring power over a two wire bus is well known in the art. Jansen teaches a coupling stages in a multi-stage power supply using a two wire bus [0v and +ve, Figure 3 and column 3, lines 45-67].

Regarding claim 4, in the final office action mailed on 4/14/04, the examiner asserted that using a differentially driven two-wire bus arrangement to connect power supply stages, is well known in the art. To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate. If applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also Zurko, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). If the examiner is relying on personal knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the

¹ included in office action mailed on 4/14/04

examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2). If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate.

In the response [filed on 8/19/04] to the office action mailed on 4/14/04, the applicant does not traverse the assertion that using a differentially driven two-wire bus arrangement to connect power supply stages, is well known in the art. Therefore, using a differentially driven two-wire bus arrangement to connect power supply stages is taken to be admitted prior art because the applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice.

Claims 8, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, US Patent no. 6,345,364, in view of, Applicant's Admitted Prior Art [AAPA].

Lee, as described above, teaches a power supply circuit for a digital processing system, but Lee does not explicitly teach that the first stage comprises a flyback converter to supply power to the display device and the second stage comprises a portion of a forward converter to supply power to the microprocessor. However, AAPA states that flyback converters are well known devices for supplying power to display devices [page 2, lines 1-3] and that forward converters are well known devices for supplying power to microprocessors [page 2, lines 12-14]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a flyback converter to

generate high voltages from low current in order to supply the display device and to use a forward converter to generate low voltages from high current in order to supply power to the microprocessor.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee, US Patent no. 6,345,364.

Lee, as described above, teaches a power supply circuit for a digital processing system, but Lee does not explicitly teach that the first output provides DC voltage and the second output provides AC voltage.

In the final office action mailed on 4/14/04, the examiner asserted that AC to DC and DC to AC converters are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to employ them in a system in order to supply appropriate voltages to components. To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider this contention."). A general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without any reference to the examiner's assertion of official notice would be inadequate. If applicant adequately traverses the examiner's assertion of official notice, the examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if the rejection is to be maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2). See also Zurko, 258 F.3d at 1386, 59 USPQ2d at 1697 ("[T]he Board [or examiner] must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings" to satisfy the substantial evidence test). If the examiner is relying on personal

knowledge to support the finding of what is known in the art, the examiner must provide an affidavit or declaration setting forth specific factual statements and explanation to support the finding. See 37 CFR 1.104(d)(2). If applicant does not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or applicant's traverse is not adequate, the examiner should clearly indicate in the next Office action that the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art because applicant either failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice or that the traverse was inadequate. If the traverse was inadequate, the examiner should include an explanation as to why it was inadequate.

In the response [filed on 8/19/04] to the office action mailed on 4/14/04, the applicant does not traverse the assertion that AC to DC and DC to AC converters are well known in the art and it would have been obvious to employ them in the system in order to supply the appropriate voltages to components. Therefore, using AC to DC and DC to AC converters in a system in order to supply appropriate voltages to components is taken to be admitted prior art because the applicant failed to traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-15 and 17-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul B Yanchus whose telephone number is (703) 305-8022. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 8:00-6:00.

Art Unit: 2116

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne H Browne can be reached on (703) 308-1159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Yanchus
September 13, 2004


LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600 2100